



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

their movement, in a word dissolves their union (947-953). Recovery from a blow means that the union, though disarranged for a time, is restored (954-962). Again, the phenomena of pleasure and pain show that sensation is due to the union of the atoms, not to the atoms *per se*. Pain is due to the disturbance of the union of the atoms (963-965), pleasure to a resumption of the *status quo ante*, that is, these sensations are due to movements of groups of atoms (966). The isolated, individual atoms can experience neither pleasure nor pain (967-972).

- (γ) The assumption that the atoms *per se* have sense leads to wildly absurd results, e. g. to the conclusion that the atoms of human beings laugh and cry and think, yes, even think about atoms! (973-990).
(To be concluded) C. K.

REVIEWS

Social and Private Life at Rome in the Time of Plautus and Terence. By Georgia Williams Leffingwell. (Volume XXXI, No. 1, of the Columbia Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law). New York: Columbia University Press (Longmans, Green and Co., Agents: 1918). Pp. 137.

This doctoral dissertation was written under the direction of the Department of History. The subject was suggested by the late Professor Botsford, the work was apparently partly done during his lifetime, and the book is dedicated to his memory. It consists of an Introduction; eight Chapters, entitled respectively Dwelling (Town and Country), Women and Marriage, Children and Education, Slaves, Freedmen and Clients, Finance and Industry, Religion, Morals and Character; and Bibliography. It is well written in clear and readable English¹.

Miss Leffingwell states it to be her purpose to assemble as far as possible the source evidence on social and private life during the first half of the second century B.C., and from this evidence to draw certain conclusions which will give a clearer understanding of the habits of thought and the feelings of the average citizen of the time.

If the author had adhered to the first part of her purpose, she would have produced a very useful book, but even her own material is not completely cited, as she herself informs us (page 19), "Frequently . . . all the references which have been found on a given point are not mentioned", but she hopes that "enough are cited to be significant and . . . conclusive". In a work of this kind lack of completeness in the material is a serious detriment, for the process of inference—the second part of Miss Leffingwell's purpose—is so difficult

that one needs all the facts upon which such inference can be based. If the inclusion of all her material would have made the book too large, it would have been better to restrict the number of the topics and give the full material for those selected. In fact the scope of the work is too ambitious for most candidates for the degree of Ph.D.; the topic of slaves alone, for example, is an ample subject for a dissertation.

The difficulty of the task which Miss Leffingwell has undertaken is sufficiently indicated by the fact that the work of a century on different parts of it has failed to produce results which are in general satisfactory to scholars. In 1811 the University of Copenhagen offered a prize for a study which should determine what is Roman and what is Greek in the dramatic methods of Plautus and Terence, and in 1912 Freidrich Leo asserted that the topics of law, of military, domestic, city, and country life, and others like them, require new investigation with a view to the separation of the Roman and the Greek elements (Plautinische Forschungen², 112). Professor Leo gives some hints as to methods which may lead to better results.

This central difficulty—disentangling the mixture of Greek and Roman elements in Plautus and Terence—is recognized by Miss Leffingwell, and she devotes most of her Introduction to a discussion of it, aiming her remarks chiefly at Sellar and Legrand, who consider the plays so essentially Greek in content that they are of little value as a basis for inferences about Roman life. This extreme view hardly requires refutation; indeed it is the chief fault of Legrand's painstaking and valuable book³ that he assumes far too much in Plautus to be Greek. But Miss Leffingwell argues herself into the other extreme, for we read (18),

It may be assumed, therefore, that the majority of the habits and allusions contained in the comedies are either conclusively Roman, Roman with Greek antecedents, or Greek customs already introduced into Rome and familiar to the Romans.

Thus the author assumes at the outset the very point which should be proved in every case by investigation of her material before she draws from that material inferences about Roman life. Even if her argument in support of the foregoing assumption were sound, she errs in considering it valid for the "majority of habits and allusions", since even in accordance with this form of stating the case there is a residue of phenomena for which the assumption is not valid. But the fact is that no such blanket principle can be assumed. The groups of phenomena differ widely, and each group may involve and often does involve a different mixture of Greek and Roman elements; e. g. the license of the slaves seems Greek, but in the matter of food Italian pork products play a large part. Or take the titles praetor, aedilis,

²Miss Leffingwell consistently spells "Legrande", and she refers to the French classicist's work as "Matière de la comédie nouvelle". This is merely the title of the first part of his book *Tableau de la Comédie Grecque pendant la période dite Nouvelle* (Κωμῳδία Νέα), Lyons, 1910, which Mr. James Loeb has translated in condensed form as *The New Greek Comedy* (1917).

¹There are, however, a good many annoying misprints and small errors, e. g. *nulrex* (for *nulrix*) repeatedly.

etc. These are Roman official titles, but it is a well known habit of the Romans to translate foreign official titles into Latin terms (compare Cicero, Nepos, etc.), and therefore such a word in Plautus may represent now a Greek official, now a Roman. Thus, Tri. 990 *vapularis meo arbitratu et novorum aedilium* very probably refers to Roman officials who had recently entered on their term of office; but in Rud. 373 *aedilis* may represent a Greek official title (compare Sonnenschein's note). In the first case, therefore, the reference is wholly Roman, in the second only the word is Roman. To argue, as Miss Leffingwell does (13 ff.), that such references as the second were intelligible to the Romans, citing as proof the Greek words in Plautus, the explanations which he sometimes attaches to things un-Roman, or the changes which he sometimes makes in such things, is not convincing. A given phenomenon may have been perfectly intelligible and yet not Roman. Moreover, there are many things in Plautus which can hardly have been intelligible to the vast majority of the audience, and yet he allows them to stand without explanation, e. g. rare mythological allusions. It has been argued indeed that the very strangeness of many things in the *comœdia palliata* added to the interest of the plays; the existence of the *togata* side by side with the *palliata* lends considerable support to this view. But however this may be, it is not proper to use as a general argument, in support of the view that the life in the plays is Roman, the statement (16) that

the verisimilitude, the realism, and hence the success of a theatrical presentation has its foundation in the reproduction of the habits of every-day life.

This statement is contradicted by many of the best scenes in the plays, and indeed by the history of the drama in all ages³.

The only method of attaining reliable results in the present problem is, as Leo and others have pointed out, to separate in each phenomenon the Roman from the Greek elements. Only after this has been done is it possible to make inferences about Roman life, and it is precisely because it has not been done at all or not consistently that so much of the work in this field is unreliable—the large handbooks and the special literature exhibit in general the same defect. The task is very difficult because of the great dearth of other contemporary Roman material with which to compare the statements of Plautus and Terence. Fredershausen, who works by a correct method and whose dissertation, *De Iure Plautino et Terentiano*, would have been very useful to Miss Leffingwell, criticizes the writers on Roman law—Voigt, Karlowa (to whom Miss Leffingwell often refers), Bekker, etc.—for assuming that what *can* be Roman *is* Roman without investigating what Greek elements may lie in the background, and adds that

³At page 15, note, the treatment of the Greek original of the *Epidicus* is referred to as an illustration of the way Plautus altered Greek customs which were abhorrent to his audience—in this case the marriage of a youth to his half-sister by a different father was cut out of the play. Miss Leffingwell states wrongly that "Attic laws permitted the marriage of brother and sister".

Meier and Schoemann use many of the same passages as a basis of inferences about Greek law!

Miss Leffingwell considers that agreement between Plautus and Cato, Polybius, Livy, etc., "verify the belief as to the value of the comedies as a field of information". Cato and Polybius are indeed our closest approximation to contemporary evidence, but they are silent about a great many things of which the present book treats, and the author is unable to resist the temptation to make inferences from the agreements of Plautus and Livy, or Cicero, or Aulus Gellius, etc., without investigating the sources of these later writers. Moreover, all the evidence from Roman sources, including that of writers like Polybius or Plutarch who are writing in Greek but dealing often with Roman subjects, should be constantly checked up by a study of the sources of Greek life for the period in question—especially the fragments of the New Comedy upon which the *comœdia palliata* is almost exclusively based. The neglect of this procedure is the great defect of the book. Miss Leffingwell's handbooks are predominantly those dealing with Roman life and she rarely cites Greek material; e. g. in the entire chapter on Women and Marriage I do not find a single reference to Greek writers or evidence.

In the Bibliography I miss Kock's (or Meineke's) fragments of Greek comedy, Koerte's *Menandrea*, Lucilius, and the best commentaries on Plautus and Terence, e. g. Brix-Niemeyer, Sonnenschein, Dziatzko-Hauser (Phormio), Dziatzko-Kauer (Adelphoe), Spengel-Rottmann (Adelphoe), etc. The only annotated edition of Plautus mentioned is Ramsay's *Mostellaria* (1869), which has long been antiquated on many points. Some of the texts cited are not the best, e. g. Spengel's edition of Varro, *De Lingua Latina*; Goetz (1910) is now the standard. Rassow's index of nouns in Plautus is also very useful in work of this sort. The special literature connected with various aspects of the work is very scantily cited. This is explained in the statement (Introduction, 19):

Modern works have been read extensively in the preparation of the following study. The results obtained, however, were largely negative, owing . . . to the lack of attention which has been paid to this particular period. For that reason only those books have been cited in the bibliography which are specifically quoted or from which definite material has been drawn.

Since, however, the present work belongs to the category of special literature, it would seem proper to mention more freely those who have attempted to solve parts of the same problem, especially since they have collected much of the same material, e. g. (on religion) T. Hubrich, *De Diis Plautinis et Terentianis* (1883), A. Kieseberg, *Quaestiones ad Religionem Spectantes* (1884), Ostermayer, *De Historia Fabulari* (1884), and the dissertation of O. Fredershausen (mentioned above), together with its continuation in *Hermes* 47. Among the handbooks there is no mention of Pauly-Wissowa.

The general impression one gains in reading the book is one of uncertainty. Undoubtedly a great many of

the inferences made concerning Roman life are correct, but one cannot feel sure because the other side of the picture, Greek life in the period of the New Comedy, is not presented. Undoubtedly also many points cannot be settled, with our present evidence, by any method; with regard to these the proper procedure is to state the *non liquet*. The book will be of some use as a partial summary of the material on private life in Plautus, Terence, Cato, Polybius, etc., but the reader will have to determine in a very large number of instances whether the details were, in the time of Plautus and Terence, Greek or Roman.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.

ARTHUR L. WHEELER.

Ancient History. Second Revised Edition. By Philip Van Ness Myers. Boston: Ginn and Company (1916). Pp. xviii + 592. \$1.64.

Three important problems which face the author of a text-book in ancient history for use in Secondary Schools are the point at which he should terminate his narrative, the relative amount of space to be allotted to the treatment of the various peoples of antiquity, and the selection of the episodes which will form a clear and connected narrative of the history of each.

The new edition of Myers's Ancient History covers the period from the Old Stone Age to 800 A. D. To those who regard ancient civilization as disintegrating after the crisis of the third century A.D., this will seem to include a large period of strictly mediaeval history. But there is no sharp break between antiquity and the Middle Ages, and it will always depend upon the individual judgment and the exigencies of the School curriculum whether these transitional centuries are to form the epilogue to ancient or the prologue to mediaeval history. With regard to the second problem the author is to be congratulated upon having avoided the pitfall into which the authors of some recent text-books have been entrapped, namely, of assigning undue space to the history and civilization of Egypt and Assyria. The influence of these lands upon modern European civilization has been indirect and of relatively small moment; consequently, in a text-book of this type they should not receive by any means so lengthy a treatment as Greece or Rome. The third problem has likewise been met in a satisfactory manner. Particularly good are the chapters on ancient society and the various aspects of its civilization; the contributions of each age and people to the civilization of subsequent ages are shown in an admirable manner, which indeed may be said to be the chief merit of the book. Altogether, to one who has mastered its contents, Myers's Ancient History should serve as an excellent introduction to further historical study and point the way to an adequate appreciation of 'the living past'.

This second revised edition aims to incorporate the results of the most recent discovery and research. This object has, in the main, been well attained; nevertheless there are still some few points where, it seems to me,

the view of the text should be revised in the light of the recent judgment of historical scholarship. These I shall mention in the following paragraphs.

93¹: It might be mentioned that there are good reasons for believing that the Hittites belonged to the Indo-European speech-group. 154: It seems that the number ten thousand is too high for the Spartans of military age. Probably they never exceeded four thousand, while the total number of Spartiatai, including women and children, was not over fifteen thousand (see Beloch, *Bevölkerung der Griechisch-Römischen Welt*, 141 ff.). 194 ff.: The account of the actual battle of Marathon is unsatisfactory (see Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*¹ 1.357 ff.; Grundy, *The Great Persian War*, Ch. IV.), and its results, important as they were, are exaggerated. It was not Marathon but Salamis and Plataea which decided the fate of Hellas. 198: It should be mentioned that the preparations of Xerxes did not go on uninterruptedly for eight years. The energies of Darius and Xerxes himself were absorbed in subduing the revolt of Egypt between 486 and 484. 201: The correct explanation of the small number of Greeks at Thermopylae is to be sought in the Greek plan of campaign, which was to meet and defeat the Persian fleet off Artemisium. Such a victory would force the withdrawal of the bulk, if not all, of the king's land forces. The garrison at Thermopylae was considered strong enough to hold its ground until the naval victory had been won (see Ernst Obst, *Der Feldzug des Xerxes*, *Klio*, Beiheft XII, 1913). 203: Athens was not burned by the Persians before Salamis, but when Mardonius evacuated Attica in 479 (see Herodotus 9.13). 203, note 1: The number of ships (750) assigned to the Persians at Salamis seems to be too high (see Obst, *op. cit.*, 90 ff.). 208: It seems to me that it is misleading to speak of Aristides as the first "president" of the Confederacy of Delos. At its inception this union was a military alliance, which hardly corresponds to our idea of a confederacy. Besides, we only know that Aristides actively promoted the league and apportioned the original obligations among its members. 209: The treasury of the league was transferred to Athens, after the Athenian disaster in Egypt, therefore in 454 B. C., not "about 457" (see Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*¹, 1.486. 238: I think one should hardly fail to mention the share of Persia in the last phase of the Peloponnesian War, and the influence of Persia upon Greek politics from that time until the rise of Macedon. 258, 259: The traditional numbers of the Persians at Issus and Arbela are hopelessly impossible, and had better be absolutely discarded in a text-book of this sort. On the other hand, there is no reference to the political value of Alexander's deification, in affording a legitimate basis for his rule over Greek cities and avoiding the stigma of a tyranny (see Eduard Meyer, *Kaiser Augustus*, in his *Kleine Schriften*, 457 ff., and W. S. Ferguson, *Greek Imperialism*, Ch. IV). 270: It might be

¹This and similar numbers refer to pages of the book.